WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ,
EDELMAN & DICKER LLP
555 South Flower Street, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213.443.5100
Facsimile: 213.443.5101

ASHLEY VINSON CRAWFORD (SBN 257246)
avcrawford@akingump.com
DANIELLE C. GINTY (SBN 261809)
dginty@akingump.com
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
580 California Street, Suite 1500
San Francisco, CA 94014
Telephone: 415.765.9500
Facsimile: 415.765.9501

Attorneys for Defendants,
D and D Marketing, Inc., d/b/a T3Leads,
Grigor Demirchyan, and Marina Demirchyan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau,

Case No. 2:15-cv-09692-PSG(Ex)

Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez

22 | Plaintiff,

V.

D and D Marketing, Inc., d/b/a T3Leads, Grigor Demirchyan, and

25 | Marina Demirchyan,

Defendants.

DECLARATION OF HERBERT P.
KUNOWSKI IN SUPPORT OF REPLY TO
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION OF
INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL AND
CONCOMITANT STAY

Hearing Date: March 27, 2017

Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom: 6A

Courthouse: First Street

28

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

26

27

$_2\parallel$

DECLARATION OF HERBERT P. KUNOWSKI

- I, Herbert P. Kunowski, declare as follows:
- 1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed and admitted to practice before all the courts in the State of California, including this U.S. District Court, and a member of the law firm of Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker LLP, counsel of record for Defendants, D and D Marketing, Inc., d/b/a T3 Leads, Grigor Demirchyan, and Marina Demirchyan (collectively "Defendants"), in the above-captioned action brought by Plaintiff, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the "Bureau"). I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein, and could and would competently testify to the following under oath.
- 2. On January 6, 2017, in response to the Bureau's counsel, Barry Reiferson, requesting that the parties schedule a Rule 26(f) conference, I requested Mr. Reiferson to stipulate to a 60-day continuance of the Scheduling Conference in this case (then set for March 20), to allow a sufficient opportunity for the Court to rule in the interim on Defendants' motion for certification of interlocutory appeal and concomitant stay (filed on December 27 and then set for hearing on the earliest date then available on the Court's online calendar: March 6). In suggesting this continuance, I sought to potentially avoid the substantial waste of resources and expense entailed from a Rule 26(f) conference through the Scheduling Conference in this fact, witness and document-intensive case. Alternatively, I suggested to Mr. Reiferson on January 6 that the Bureau

agree to file its opposition to Defendants' certification motion earlier than required, that Defendants would likewise agree to file their reply earlier than required, and that Defendants' fully-briefed motion may then be ruled upon by the Court earlier than expected. As I explained to Mr. Reiferson, both of my proposals were solely for purposes of ensuring the fair, orderly and efficient progress of this litigation by first having the certification motion adjudicated and allowing Defendants to otherwise pursue their potential appellate remedies on the constitutional issues in this case. However, Mr. Reiferson advised me on January 6 that the Bureau would not stipulate to either of my proposals, and would oppose Defendants seeking such relief. In response to my inquiry as to why the Bureau was unwilling to agree to either of my proposals that I told Mr. Reiferson should be in the best interest of all concerned, Mr. Reiferson would only say that it was not for the Bureau to "manage" the Court's calendar.

3. Consistent with the foregoing, and contrary to the declaration of Mr. Reiferson and the Bureau's other representations to this Court, my clients never agreed to participate in a Rule 26(f) conference on February 27, and I rejected Mr. Reiferson's requests for me to confirm my clients' participation.

///

///